

Alexandria, VA 22314

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR R.305009 Hans-Peter Braun 5458 10/782,834 02/23/2004 EXAMINER 7590 10/11/2005 RONALD E. GREIGG MILLER, CARL STUART GREIGG & GREIGG P.L.L.C. PAPER NUMBER ART UNIT Suite One 1423 Powhatan Street 3747

DATE MAILED: 10/11/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



Advisory Action

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/782,834	BRAUN, HANS-PETER		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Carl S. Miller	3747		

Autisory Action	10/102,004	DIO (011, 11) (10-1 E1		
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Carl S. Miller	3747		
-The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress	
THE REPLY FILED 06 September 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.				
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. 				
b) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the mail rejection. The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In				
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).				
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL				
	pliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be	filed within two month	ns of the date of	
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). AMENDMENTS				
	but prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered by	ecalise	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);				
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE belo		, ,		
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in be		ducing or simplifying	the issues for	
appeal; and/or				
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a	-	ected claims.		
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).				
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).				
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):				
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).				
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended. The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:				
Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>4-10</u> .				
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:				
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	•			
8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).	ut before or on the date of filing a No d sufficient reasons why the affidav	otice of Appeal will <u>no</u> rit or other evidence is	ot be entered s necessary and	
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessar	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appea y and was not earlier presented. S	al and/or appellant fai ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(ils to provide a 1).	
10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	on of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ned.	
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered by See Continuation Sheet.	ut does NOT place the application in	n condition for allowar	nce because:	
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s).				
13. Other:				

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The examiner does not agree with applicant's assertion that there is no conduit shown in element (50) that is distinct from the cap (59). The cap (59) includes the required opening and the walls of the housing (50) form a conduit. Finally, the claim does not say that the mounting element cannot be in both the connection opening and the conduit.

Carl S, Milia

Primary Exemina